



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 20, 2003

Mr. Michael R. Aulick
Executive Director
Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-1088

OR2003-8345

Dear Mr. Aulick:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191328.

The Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization ("CAMPO") received a request for information regarding proposals submitted for its 2003 Congestion Monitoring and Analysis Program. You ask whether the submitted information should be excepted from disclosure as third party proprietary information. You state that you notified Wilbur Smith Associates ("WSA") and Carter & Burgess, Inc. ("Carter & Burgess") of the request.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party

¹Section 552.305 provides in relevant part that in giving notice to a private party whose proprietary interests may be implicated by a request for information, the governmental body must include:

(B) a statement, *in the form prescribed by the attorney general*, that the person is entitled to submit in writing to the attorney general within a reasonable time not later than the 10th business day after the date the person receives the notice:

- (i) each reason the person has as to why the information should be withheld; and
- (ii) a letter, memorandum, or brief in support of that reason.

Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B) (emphasis added). The attorney general's prescribed form is available at Appendix C of this office's Public Information Handbook and on the Attorney General's website at www.oag.state.tx.us.

to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor's representative. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Carter & Burgess has not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect its proprietary interests. However, Carter & Burgess did inform CAMPO that their information is proprietary in nature and, therefore, is confidential. Because Carter & Burgess has provided us with no explanation as to why it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information, the submitted Carter & Burgess proposal must be released. See Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

WSA has submitted comments in which WSA argues that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or

to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would

likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

With respect to information in the WSA proposal, we find that WSA has not established that any portion of its proposal is excepted from disclosure as a trade secret pursuant to section 552.110(a). Furthermore, WSA has not demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that release any portion of its proposal would result in substantial competitive injury to the company. Thus, we are unable to determine that section 552.110(b) applies to the WSA proposal. Accordingly, CAMPO may not withhold any portion of the WSA proposal pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. As WSA claims no other exceptions, the WSA proposal must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Amy D. Peterson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 191328

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Peter D. Kennedy
George & Donaldson, L.L.P.
114 West 7th Street, Suite 1100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard C. Mobley, II
Wilbur Smith Associates
9800 Richmond Avenue, Suite 400
Houston, Texas 77042-4521
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Taylor
Carter & Burgess, Inc.
7950 Elmbrook
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)